

REMARKS

Claims 1-11, 15-73 and 80-85 are pending. The Applicant respectfully requests consideration of the following remarks.

35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejections

Claims 27 and 85 were cancelled, thereby obviating this rejection.

35 U.S.C. § 101 Rejections

Claim 65 was amended to recite “implemented by a computer,” thereby obviating this rejection.

35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Rejections

Claims 80-84 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,200,864 to Hollingsworth (hereinafter “Hollingsworth”). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 80 has been amended, and as amended (portions of the amendment appear in bold/italics below) recites a computer-implemented method comprising:

- retrieving a list of user accounts *that correspond to a single user* from an identity integration system having persisted identity information regarding the user accounts wherein, the identity integration system includes a management agent for each of multiple data sources configured specifically for its respective data source to manage data communication between the identity integration system and each respective data source;
- outputting a user interface showing the list of user accounts *that correspond to the single user* on a display;

- allowing each account in the list to be selected using a user interface selection device operable to input selections via the user interface output on the display;
- allowing input of a new password via the user interface selection device; and
- allowing input of a request to update old passwords associated with each of the selected accounts to the new password input via the user interface.

The Examiner in the *Response to Arguments* section suggested further definition of what a user account is intended to encompass and suggested “is it specific for the user.” In the interests of furthering prosecution, the Applicant has amended the claim to recite “a single user” and therefore is believed to be allowable over the submitted references. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 81 depends either directly or indirectly from claim 80 and is allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. Each of the dependent claims is allowable based on the same rationale discussed with respect to claim 80. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 80, are neither shown nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one another. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 82 has been amended, and as amended (portions of the amendment appear in bold/italics below) recites one or more computer readable storage media containing instructions that are executable by a computer to perform actions, comprising:

- selecting multiple data sources connected to an identity integration system;
- receiving a new password input by *a single* user to cause the new password to be associated with each of the selected multiple data sources; and
- using the identity integration system to collectively update a password associated with each of the selected multiple data sources to the new password input by the user.

The Examiner in the *Response to Arguments* section suggested further definition of what a user account is intended to encompass and suggested “is it specific for the user.” In the interests of furthering prosecution, the Applicant has amended the claim to recite “a single user” and therefore is believed to be allowable over the submitted references. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 83-85 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 82 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. Each of the dependent claims is allowable based on the same rationale discussed with respect to claim 82. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 82, are neither shown nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one another.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

Claims 1-11, 15-20, 22-69, 71-73 and 85 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hollingsworth as applied to claims 80-84 in view of U.S. Application No. 2003/0233439 to Stone et al (hereinafter “Stone”). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 1 has been amended, and as amended (portions of the amendment appear in bold/italics below) recites a method, comprising:

- outputting a user interface configured to interact with an identity integration system to perform collective password management for multiple user accounts *each of the multiple user accounts being* associated with a *single* user;
- receiving a selection of selecting multiple data sources connected to an the identity integration system input by the *single* user via the user interface, wherein:
 - each of the multiple data sources corresponds to a different one of said multiple user accounts;
 - the identity integration system includes a management agent for each of the multiple data sources configured specifically for its respective data source to manage data communication between the identity integration system and each respective data source; *and*
 - for at least some of the multiple data sources a management agent for the data source is configured with credentials to perform password management for a corresponding said user account;
- receiving a new password input by *the single* user via the user interface; and
- performing an administrative password operation on a multiple passwords each associated with each one of the selected multiple data sources to collectively update each said of the multiple passwords to the new password, wherein the password operation is performed using the identity integration system.

The Examiner in the *Response to Arguments* section suggested further definition of what a user account is intended to encompass and suggested “is it specific for the user.” In the interests of furthering prosecution, the Applicant has amended the

claim to recite “a single user” and therefore is believed to be allowable over the submitted references. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-12 and 15-52 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. Each of the dependent claims is allowable based on the same rationale discussed with respect to claim 1. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 1, are neither shown nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one another.

Claim 53 has been amended, and as amended (portions of the amendment appear in bold/italics below) recites an apparatus comprising:

- a processor; and
- a web application for password management executable on the processor having one or more modules including:
 - a user identifier to find user identity information in an identity integration system *that corresponds to a single user*, wherein:
 - the identity integration system includes a management agent for each of multiple data sources to manage data communication between the identity integration system and each respective data source; and
 - for at least one of the multiple data sources a management agent for the data source calls for custom logic configured as code, from a custom logic source outside the identity integration system, to perform password management for the data source;
 - identity information query logic to search information in the identity integration system for accounts associated with the *single* user;
 - an account lister to display the accounts associated with the *single* user;
 - an account selector to designate at least some of the displayed accounts for password management;

- a password inputter to determine a new password input by the *single* user to associate with each designated accounts; and
- a password manager to collectively manage passwords for the designated accounts *that correspond to the single user* by requesting an update of a password associated with each designated account to the new password, responsive to the user input.

The Examiner in the *Response to Arguments* section suggested further definition of what a user account is intended to encompass and suggested “is it specific for the user.” In the interests of furthering prosecution, the Applicant has amended the claim to recite “a single user” and therefore is believed to be allowable over the submitted references. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 54-61 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 53 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. Each of the dependent claims is allowable based on the same rationale discussed with respect to claim 53. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 53, are neither shown nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one another.

Claim 61 has been amended, and as amended (portions of the amendment appear in bold/italics below) recites an apparatus comprising a processor coupled to memory, the memory storing one or more modules executable via the processor to implement:

- an interface for coupling an identity integration system with a password management web application;
- logic for communicating with the identity integration system, wherein:

- the identity integration system is capable of collectively updating a password on multiple data sources that use various functions of password updating responsive to input of a single new password by a *single* user;
- *each said data source includes a user account that corresponds to the single user;*
- the identity integration system includes a management agent for each of the multiple data sources to manage data communication between the identity integration system and each respective data source; *and*
- for at least some of the multiple data sources a management agent for the data source is configured with credentials to perform password management; and
- logic for communicating with the password management web application;
- logic for searching for objects in the identity integration system; and
- logic for checking a connection status between the identity integration system and a data source.

The Examiner in the *Response to Arguments* section suggested further definition of what a user account is intended to encompass and suggested “is it specific for the user.” In the interests of furthering prosecution, the Applicant has amended the claim to recite “a single user” and therefore is believed to be allowable over the submitted references. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 62-64 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 61 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. Each of the dependent claims is allowable based on the same rationale discussed with respect to claim 61. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 61, are neither shown nor suggested in the

references of record, either singly or in combination with one another.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 65, has been amended, and as amended (portions of the amendment appear in bold/italics below) recites a password management system, comprising:

- an identity integration system ***implemented by a computer*** having a metaverse space for persisting integrated identity information regarding ***a plurality of*** accounts associated with a ***single*** user, and a connector space for persisting information representing multiple data sources connectable to the identity integration system, the accounts each corresponding to one of the multiple data sources and having associated manageable passwords;
- a web application ***implemented by the computer*** for producing a list of the accounts from the identity integration system, for allowing selection of at least some of the accounts, ***configured*** for ***input*** of a new password to cause the new password to be associated with each of the selected accounts, and for requesting the identity integration system to collectively update passwords on each of the selected accounts to the input new password; and
- an interface ***implemented by the computer*** to communicatively couple the identity integration system with the web application.

The Examiner in the *Response to Arguments* section suggested further definition of what a user account is intended to encompass and suggested “is it specific for the user.” In the interests of furthering prosecution, the Applicant has amended the claim to recite “a single user” and therefore is believed to be allowable over the submitted references. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 66-80 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 65 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. Each of the dependent claims is allowable based on the same rationale discussed with respect to claim 65.

These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 65, are neither shown nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one another. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 21 and 70 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hollinger (It is again assumed that the Examiner meant Hollingsworth) and Stone as applied to claims 1-11, 15-20, 22-69, 71-73 and 85 above in view of U.S. Patent Application 2002/00883012 to Bush et al. (hereinafter “Bush”). **Claims 21 and 70** depend either directly or indirectly from claims 1 and 65 respectively and are allowable as depending from allowable base claims. Each of the dependent claims is allowable based on the same rationale discussed with respect to claims 1 and 65. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claims 1 and 65, are neither shown nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one another. The addition of the reference Bush, therefore, does not cure the deficiencies already discussed above with regard to claims 1 and 65. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

The Application is in a condition for allowance. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and issuance of the present application. Should any issue remain that prevents immediate issuance of the application, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney to discuss the unresolved issue.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated May 3, 2009

By: /William J. Breen, III/
William J. Breen, III
Reg. No. 45,313
509.755.7253